

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

NKUMA UCHE,) CASE NO. 4:09CV3106

Plaintiff,)

v.)

NORTH STAR CAPITAL)
ACQUISITION, LLC, KIRK E.)
BRUMBAUGH, MARK QUANDAHL,)
KARL VON OLDENBERG, SARA)
MILLER, and CORY ROONEY,)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER

NKUMA UCHE,) CASE NO. 4:09CV3123

Plaintiff,)

v.)

BRUMBAUGH & QUANDAHL, P.C.,)
Defendant.)

These matters are before the court on numerous Motions and Objections filed by the parties relating to discovery. (Case No. 4:09CV3123, Filing Nos. [79](#) and [83](#); Case No. 4:09CV3106, Filing Nos. [148](#), [152](#), [158](#), [159](#), and [161](#).) Summarized and condensed, Plaintiff seeks leave to serve approximately 25-30 additional interrogatories on each Defendant.¹ Defendants object to this request because Plaintiff has already deposed each Defendant and because Defendants have already responded to numerous written

¹Permitting Plaintiff to serve the requested number of interrogatories results in Plaintiff propounding between 55 and 65 interrogatories per Defendant.

discovery requests. Plaintiff also generally objects to Defendants' responses to requests for admission because Defendants supplied the same or similar answers for each Defendant.

The court has carefully reviewed the record. Plaintiff has indeed deposed each Defendant and has propounded extensive written discovery, including hundreds of requests for admission and 25 interrogatories per Defendant. However, it also appears that Plaintiff may have learned facts during these depositions which now require him to propound additional interrogatories. In light of this, Plaintiff is given leave to serve 10 additional interrogatories on each Defendant and Defendants shall have 30 days in which to serve responses.

Regarding Plaintiff's objections to Defendants' requests for admission responses, the court finds that Defendants have fully complied with their obligations to respond. The record shows that Plaintiff has propounded a total of more than 1,000 requests for admission on Defendants and Defendants timely responded to all of those requests. Plaintiff complains generally about the insufficiency of Defendants' responses because many of the answers, set forth by each Defendant, are the same. Although Plaintiff may be correct, these general complaints do not allow the court to determine the adequacy of any specific response. If Plaintiff objects to a specific response, he must file a detailed motion setting forth his specific request for admission, Defendants' response, and the argument supporting why the response is inadequate. However, Plaintiff's general objections are denied.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's Motions for Leave to Increase Interrogatories (Case No. 4:09CV3123, Filing No. 79; Case No. 4:09CV3106, Filing No. 148) are granted in part. Plaintiff is given leave to serve 10 additional interrogatories on each Defendant; and
2. All other pending Motions and Objections relating to discovery (Case No. 4:09CV3123, Filing No. 83; Case No. 4:09CV3106, Filing Nos. 152, 158, 159, and 161) are denied.

DATED this 15th day of July, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp
United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.